



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.                          | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR  | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/675,033                               | 09/28/2000  | Blair B.A. Birmingham | ATI-000090          | 7656             |
| 34456                                    | 7590        | 02/06/2007            | EXAMINER            |                  |
| LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP |             |                       | PATEL, HARESH N     |                  |
| 5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE                |             |                       | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| SUITE 200                                |             |                       | 2154                |                  |
| AUSTIN, TX 78730                         |             |                       |                     |                  |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE   | MAIL DATE   |                       | DELIVERY MODE       |                  |
| 3 MONTHS                                 | 02/06/2007  |                       | PAPER               |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

|                              |                          |                        |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.          | Applicant(s)           |
|                              | 09/675,033               | BIRMINGHAM, BLAIR B.A. |
|                              | Examiner<br>Haresh Patel | Art Unit<br>2154       |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                         | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-46 are subject to examination.

### ***Double Patenting***

2. The claims 1-46 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory double patenting over claims 1-64 of copending Application Number 10/869,165, please office action dated 3/24/2006. The applicant states, “Applicant traverses with the rejection, ..., Applicant declines to file a terminal disclaimer at this time”. However, the applicant has failed to provide any arguments for the traversal. The double patenting rejection is maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. The claims 7-9, 11-25, 44-46 are software per se that is not tangibly embodied on a computer storage medium such as memory and therefore lacks a practical application because it alone cannot produce its intended outcome. Also, the claim 1 and its dependent claims perform executing but do not produce concrete and tangible results. The claim 7 and its dependent claims contain operating systems “to be” executed, not executed, which is not stored on the memory, and do not produce concrete and tangible results. The claim 18 and its dependent claims do not produce concrete and tangible results. The claim 26 and its

dependent claims perform executing but do not produce concrete and tangible results. Note: The execution by itself does not produce concrete and tangible results. It's not until the result of the execution is made available that it becomes a tangible result, which enables any usefulness of having done the execution to be realized.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 18-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification of this application under examination in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art to use and/or make the invention.

The specification of this application under examination does not contain what "computer readable medium" is.

5. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification of this application under examination in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Storages such as memory for the plurality of

operating systems and the providing mechanism are critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). The claim 1 contain “providing a plurality of operating systems on a single information handling device”, however, without storages such as memory, the device cannot have the operating systems. There is no support on (providing mechanism) who and how the providing of the operating systems is done. Also, it is not possible to have the operating systems provided on a single information handling device, as providing to the storages devices can be done, but not providing on as claimed. Similar applies to claims 18 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 26 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 7 and its dependent claims.

Claim 1 contain “executing the appliance operating system”, and “executing the general operating system”, together in the claim, which is contrary to the claim 8, which clearly states, “bios is to control which of said plurality of operating systems is executed”, meaning only one operating system is executed. Also, it is not apparent how the claim 1 can have two operating systems executed and active at the same time. Also, it is not possible to have another operating system executed when the first operating system is still executed and active. Similar applies to claims 18 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 26 and its dependent claims.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Device drivers for controlling the appliances is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). The claim 1 contain “the appliance operating system to control a subset of the one or more appliances”,

however, without having device drivers specific to the appliances the appliance operating system cannot control the appliances (hardware). Also, it is not possible to have the appliance operating system to directly communicate with the appliance (hardware) itself (through the network etc., see claims 11-16), as there is no interface/interfacing between the appliance operating system and the appliances in the claimed subject matter of the claim 1. Similar applies to claims 18 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 26 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 7 and its dependent claims.

Claim 18 and its dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Claim 18 contain “appliance operating system on a general purpose information handling system”. It is not possible to have a general purpose system (as in the claim 18) because the appliance operating system is specific to the appliance and not for general purpose as claimed. Hence, general purpose system and the appliance (specific) operating system cannot exist together. Also, it is not apparent how operating system can be implemented on a system. One of ordinary skilled in the art very well knows that software is implemented in a system. In fact, the claims 11, 12, 31, 37, etc., clearly mention that the appliances are coupled to the device and the appliances being across a network and the appliances being media handling systems (multiple), television, DVD player, etc. Even “general purpose information” is not possible because each appliance contain its respective (specific) information, hence multiple distinct information, rather general purpose as claimed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and its dependent claims recite the limitations, “single information handling device”. These limitations are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). It is not apparent how “single information handling device having one or more appliances” is possible, as it one hand states single device and on other hand has multiple appliances, which is contrary to single. In fact, the claims 11, 12, 31, 37, etc., clearly mention that the appliances are coupled to the device and the appliances being across a network and the appliances being media handling systems (multiple), television, DVD player, etc. Even “single information” is not possible because each appliance contain its respective (specific) information, hence multiple information, rather single information as claimed. Similar applies to claims 26 and its dependent claims.

Claims 1 and its dependent claims recite the limitations, “an appliance operating system dedicated to control the information handling device to operate a subset of the one or more appliances”. These limitations are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). It is not apparent how the appliance operating system is dedicated; when the same appliance is used for multiple functions, 1) to control the information handling device 2) operate multiple appliances (a subset of the one or more appliances). In fact, the appliance operating system also controls the information handling device similar to the general operating system. Similar applies

to claims 18 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 26 and its dependent claims.

Similar applies to claims 7 and its dependent claims.

The term "general operating system" in claims 1 and dependent claims is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. It is not apparent what is considered as "general" as the specification of this application under prosecution clearly states, "while a general operating system would be limited to controlling the built in CD player", which in fact is similar to the appliance operating system because the CD player is an appliance too. One of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention very clearly knows that each operating system, including an appliance operating system also perform tasks that the general operating system performs as claimed in the claim. Similar applies to claims 18 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 26 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 7 and its dependent claims.

The term "general information handling tasks" in claims 1 and dependent claims is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. It is not apparent what is considered as "general information handling tasks" as the specification of this application under prosecution clearly states, "while a general operating system would be limited to controlling the built in CD player", which in fact is similar to the tasks handled by the appliance operating system because the CD player is an appliance too. Also it is not apparent that the general information and /or tasks are for the general operating system itself or multiple operating systems. One of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention very clearly knows that each operating system, including an appliance operating system also perform tasks that the general operating system performs as claimed in the claim. Similar applies to claims 18 and its dependent claims. Similar

Art Unit: 2154

applies to claims 26 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 7 and its dependent claims.

Claims 1 and its dependent claims recite the limitations, “the appliance operating system is independent of the general operating system”. These limitations are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). It is not apparent how the appliance operating system is independent when the claims 3, 42-46, etc., clearly show that the appliance operating system and the general operating system depend on each other for switching, etc. Similar applies to claims 18 and its dependent claims. Similar applies to claims 7 and its dependent claims.

Claims 4 recite the limitations, “executing … operating systems concurrently” (along with general operating system performing general information handling tasks). These limitations are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). It is not apparent how the general operating system can perform general information tasks when the other appliance operating system is executing (during the switching period) as one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention very well knows that the general operating is waiting to be executed in the concurrent processing (during the switching period). When the appliance operating system(s) have their turn the general operating system cannot do anything and the general operating system cannot perform any general tasks that are general and needed for the device when the appliance operating system(s) have their turn. Similar applies to claim 22. Similar applies to claims 26 and its dependent claims.

Claim 3 recites the limitations, “the execution”. These limitations are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). It is not apparent which executing it is referred to.

Claims 30, 33, 36 recite the limitations, “the memory device”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d)).

Claim 18 recites the limitations, “instructions to implement an appliance operating system on a general purpose information handling system”. These limitations are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). In fact, the appliance operating system is not implemented but it is already present on a memory, etc. (see claims 5, etc.).

Claims 26 and its dependent claims recite the limitations, “appliance operating system on a singe information handling system”, “general operating system on the singe information handling system”. These limitations are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). The operating systems on a system cannot exist.

Note: Examiner has made an earnest effort to locate the limitations from the claims that are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The applicant is requested to fix similar limitations, which the examiner might have overlooked, from the claims including other groups of claims.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Haresh Patel*

Haresh Patel

December 1, 2006